



22101373358

AOC. 41

The National Anti-Vivisection Society

OFFICES: 92 VICTORIA STREET, LONDON, S.W.1.

President: LORD LEIGH.

Vice-Presidents.

The DUCHESS OF SOMERSET.
The DUKE OF HAMILTON.
The DUCHESS OF HAMILTON.
The DOWAGER MARCHIONESS OF
QUEENSBERRY.
LA DUCHESSA DI STO. TEODORO.
The EARL OF BUCHAN.
The DOWAGER COUNTESS OF IL-
CHESTER.
JULIA, COUNTESS OF SHANNON.
The COUNTESS OF CROMARTIE.
The EARL LOREBURN, G.C.M.G.
The LORD ERNEST HAMILTON.
VISCOUNT CLIFDEN.

The VISCOUNTESS CHURCHILL, V.A.
LORD HATHERTON.
LORD COLERIDGE.
The LADY LLANGATTOCK.
The BARONESS DORCHESTER.
BISHOP INGHAM.
The Very Rev. M. B. HUTCHISON,
D.D.
Rt. Hon. SIR DAVID HARREL, G.C.B.
Rt. Hon. R. R. CHERRY.
Sir GERALD CODRINGTON, Bart.
Sir WILLIAM WATSON, LL.D.
Archdeacon R. T. TALBOT, D.D.
Mrs. GROVE-GRADY.

CHAS. J. WELD-BLUNDELL, Esq.

Director and Treasurer.—THE HONBLE. STEPHEN COLERIDGE.

Acting Secretary and Lecturer.—R. SOMERVILLE WOOD, Esq.,
M.A. (Oxon.).



ITS POLICY.

The Society advocates the total abolition of the scientific torture of animals, and seeks to attain this object by every possible means. The Society does not oppose, but on the contrary supports, any and every measure for the amelioration of the present condition of vivisected animals.

All humane people who approve of these reasonable tactics, and are desirous of seeing something practical done to save tortured animals, are earnestly invited to support the National Anti-Vivisection Society.

Member's Annual Subscription, 10s. Life Membership, £5.

Subscription to THE ANIMALS' DEFENDER AND ZOOPHILIST, the Organ of the Society, 1s. 6d. per annum, Post Free.

Cheques (crossed "Bank of England") and P.O.O's should be made payable to "The National Anti-Vivisection Society."

Telegraphic Address: "Zoophilist, Sowest, London." Telephone: No. 4705 Victoria.

W. Pictor. (Please return)

THE HISTORY
OF THE
ANTI-VIVISECTION
MOVEMENT

AND OF THE
NATIONAL ANTI-VIVISECTION
SOCIETY

BEING A SUMMARY OF AN ADDRESS DELIVERED BY
THE HONBLE. STEPHEN COLERIDGE



THE NATIONAL ANTI-VIVISECTION SOCIETY
92 VICTORIA STREET, S.W.1

1921

**WELLCOME
LIBRARY**

General Collections

P

199

The History of the Anti-Vivisection Movement

THE HISTORY OF THE ANTI-VIVISECTION
MOVEMENT AND OF THE
NATIONAL ANTI-VIVISECTION SOCIETY.

The public interest in the cause was first aroused by Miss Cobbe, who was at Florence when Professor Schiff of that city inflicted some of the most atrocious tortures upon animals that the ingenuity of man could devise, inventing instruments for the sole purpose of producing the last extremity of agony. Miss Cobbe's indignation and horror roused her to devote the rest of her life to denouncing vivisection.

Soon after her public revelations of Professor Schiff's abominations, she drew the attention of the public to a book published in England, called the "Handbook of Physiology," in which, with cynical heartlessness, Professor Burdon Sanderson described, for students to imitate, some utterly pitiless experiments upon dogs—this was in 1873. In 1874, at a meeting of medical men at Norwich, a Dr. Magnan, a Frenchman, had the effrontery to torture

a dog before the assembled doctors, some of whom had the decency to protest and cry out "Shame!" Something of a scene took place, and some humane men in the audience attempted to stop the cruelty and release the fastened down dog.

The R.S.P.C.A. started a prosecution under Martin's Act of this cowardly wretch, together with four or five others for aiding and abetting him. But Dr. Magnan discreetly slipped away to France, and action against the others therefore naturally failed in the absence of the nimble vivisector.

Credit must be given to the R.S.P.C.A. for endeavouring to bring this horrid Dr. Magnan to justice.

In the following year, 1875, Miss Cobbe made an eloquent appeal to the Council of the R.S.P.C.A. to bring into Parliament a Bill for the restriction of vivisection. The Society appointed a sub-committee to deal with the matter, and sent their Secretary, Mr. Colam, to visit some of the leading vivisectors in England and report what they had to say. Naturally, nothing came of such an inquiry from the very persons whose practices were being denounced.

So Miss Cobbe proceeded to prepare a Bill herself, providing for the restriction of vivisection, in which she was assisted by Lord Coleridge, then Lord Chief Justice of the Common Pleas. This Bill was introduced into the House of Lords by Lord Henniker—but in June the Government appointed the first Royal Commission to inquire into and report upon the question of vivisection.

All Bills were consequently withdrawn.

This Royal Commission issued its report on January 8th of the next year, 1876.

In the meantime, in December of 1875, The National Anti-Vivisection Society was founded by Miss Cobbe and others, and was known at first as "The Society for Protection of Animals liable to Vivisection," subsequently it became "The Victoria Street Society for the Protection of Animals from Vivisection, United with the International Association for the Total Suppression of Vivisection," and later on, at Mr. Coleridge's instance, it assumed its present title, as a title with twenty-two words in it was ludicrously cumbersome.

In 1876 Lord Carnarvon, in consultation with Miss Cobbe, introduced a Bill into the House of Lords which was passed. It was the present Act, without the provisos which largely destroyed its efficacy as a measure to prevent cruel vivisections. Mr. Cross, then Home Secretary, afterwards Lord Cross, introduced it as a Government measure in the House of Commons, very late in the session; he was harassed by a monster petition from doctors and clamant protests from Fellows of the Royal Society. August was advancing, ministers and legislators were tired and impatient to get the session finished—indeed the claims of grouse, which it is necessary to shoot in great numbers on the 12th of that month, could not lightly be ignored—and on the 10th Mr. Cross, with his eye on the Bradshaw, yielded to the physiological clamour and admitted amendments

to the Bill which left it a mutilated, emasculated mockery, forbidding in one clause what it permits in another.

Miss Cobbe, most naturally, like many another ardent soul, felt a sense of deep mortification at this pusillanimous surrender by Mr. Cross to the shrieking brotherhood of the coward Science, and in October she urged the Committee of our Society to advance from restriction to total prohibition of vivisection as their object, but the Committee did not agree.

However, two years later, in August, 1878, we find that she succeeded in persuading a majority of the Committee to include total prohibition in their programme. Dr. Hoggan and others then reluctantly left the Society.

The question was unfortunately never submitted to a meeting of the subscribers, who were not consulted at all in the matter.

It is also to be observed that there is nothing in the Minutes of the meetings of the Committee excluding or abandoning restriction as part of the policy advocated by the Society.

All that occurred in August 1878 was that the Committee decided to include prohibition in the programme of the Society.

When Mr. Coleridge became Honorary Secretary of the Society, in succession to Miss Cobbe, almost his first act was to call a general meeting of all the subscribers, at which the future policy of the Society was put before them for decision, and a resolution was passed as follows:—

“The Council affirm that, while the demand for the total abolition of vivisection will ever remain the ultimate object of the National Anti-Vivisection Society, the Society is not thereby precluded from making efforts in Parliament for Lesser Measures, having for their object the saving of animals from scientific torture.”

Miss Cobbe unfortunately was unwilling to abide by the decision of the members, and she retired from the Society, together with about five per cent. of the members, and shortly afterwards started a new Society, called the “British Union for Abolition of Vivisection,” which devotes its energies to the two objects of advocating the total abolition of all vivisection, painless or painful, and of opposing the efforts of any Anti-Vivisection Society that makes efforts to obtain any amelioration of the condition of vivisected animals other than by demanding the prohibition of all experiments upon them, whether painless or not.

In 1889 the Lord Mayor of London announced in the papers that there would be a Public Meeting at the Mansion House to promote the foundation of a Pasteur Institute in this country similar to that in Paris.

Mr. Coleridge at once secured a promise from the Lord Chief Justice of England and Cardinal Manning that they would go together to this advertised Public Meeting and oppose the Lord Mayor's proposal. Mr. Coleridge then went to the Mansion House and informed the Lord Mayor of the intentions of the Cardinal and the Chief Justice; the Lord Mayor received the information with dismay, and forthwith, with Mr. Coleridge's advice, immediately

announced in all the papers that the Public Meeting would not take place. A ticket meeting was substituted, at which much laudation was poured upon M. Pasteur and his dog-torture dens in Paris, but no Pasteur Institute was then or has ever since been proposed to be erected in England.

There are Pasteur Institutes in every European country except England, and hydrophobia thrives in all those countries. It is unknown in England.

The Anti-Vivisectionists, headed by Cardinal Manning and the Lord Chief Justice, saved England from the setting up of a torture den for dogs. Instead of that abomination rabies has been entirely abolished in this country by the simple device of muzzling dogs when necessary. No doubt muzzling is a real discomfort to some dogs, but discomfort is better than exquisite torment.

For many years our Society published the names of persons who had died of hydrophobia after being inoculated at the Pasteur Institute, together with the authorities vouching for their deaths from the disease. The list ran into many hundreds of names.

In one case where the inoculated person died of hydrophobia the dog that had bitten him survived and never had the disease, which accounts for a reluctance, that has subsequently been observed, on the part of the gentlemen with the squirts, to inject the Pasteur nostrum into persons bitten by putative mad dogs unless and until they know that the dog is dead. It has been stated, but we have

not seen the statistics, that the deaths from hydrophobia in France per million living persons increased after the establishment of the Pasteur Institute.

In 1897, when Mr. Coleridge had for some time been Honorary Treasurer of the Society, he accompanied Bishop Barry to Marlborough House and endeavoured to secure a pledge from His Royal Highness the Prince of Wales that he would not permit any of the great Hospital Fund, which he was inaugurating in commemoration of the Jubilee of Her Majesty Queen Victoria, to be diverted to the support of the Medical Schools attached to the London Hospitals.

After some initial rebuffs, His Royal Highness was graciously pleased to grant us our request, which was finally given definitely in writing in the following letter:—

Marlborough House,
Pall Mall, S.W.
May 8th, 1897.

DEAR SIR,

In compliance with your request, I have laid your letter and enclosure before the Prince of Wales.

I think you must have forgotten that when I had the pleasure of seeing you and Bishop Barry at Marlborough House, I distinctly stated, in His Royal Highness' name, that there was no intention of devoting any part of the London Hospital Fund towards the support of the Medical Laboratories.

I am, yours faithfully,
(Signed) FRANCIS KNOLLYS.

For eight years after this event many of the great Hospitals continued to subsidise the contiguous schools out of the Hospital's general fund, and as the

contributions from the Prince of Wales Fund, subsequently King Edward's Hospital Fund, were paid into the general funds of the Hospitals, it seemed to show that the beneficent intentions of the King, as set forth in his letter of May 8th, 1897, were being flouted and ignored.

Mr. Coleridge made this clear to the public in an article published in the *Contemporary Review*, November, 1904, entitled "A Great Breach of Trust."

Mr. Coleridge said he also attended a meeting of the delegates of the Metropolitan Radical Federation, and, laying the facts before them, induced them to enter the lists against these subsidies from the Hospitals to the vivisectioning schools, and a very racy correspondence ensued between that body and the Council of King Edward's Fund, in which the Federation remarked :

"If ink be poured into the top of a tub from which water is drawn next day by a tap at the bottom the water will be discoloured.

"An undertaking that no ink shall flow out of that tap is not fulfilled by putting ink into that tub, unless the ink is tightly corked in a bottle of its own."

The end of all this agitation carried on by our Society, and those who came to its assistance, was that King Edward's Hospital Fund appointed a Committee composed of Sir Edward Fry, Lord Welby and the Bishop of Stepney (now Archbishop of York) to inquire and report on :—

I. "Whether any, and if any how much, money given or subscribed for the relief of the sick poor to the twelve London Hospitals having Medical Schools, is contributed,

directly or indirectly, by those Hospitals, or any of them, for the maintenance of medical education.

2. "Whether any direct or indirect return for such contributions (if any) is received by the Hospitals from their Medical Schools, and, if so, whether such return is equivalent to the amount of the contributions.

3. "Whether, in the event of the Committee finding that any Hospital contributes to its Medical School a sum in excess of the return it receives from the Medical School, there are any special considerations advanced in justification of such expenditure, or any general considerations which would apply to all Hospitals having Medical Schools."

Mr. Coleridge went before that Committee as a witness, and in the end the Committee reported as follows :—

"We venture to submit that the distinction between the hospital and the school should in every case be drawn, not only definitely and exactly, but with such clearness that it may be understood by the general public, and so that no question may arise as to the destination and application of moneys contributed, whether by the King's Fund or from any other source."

No more complete vindication of this Society's long fight against the diversion of Hospital Funds to Schools wherein animals are vivisected could very well be pronounced, than this concluding paragraph of Sir Edward Fry's Committee.

In 1902 the Duke of Portland, who had taken the chair for the Society at a mass meeting at St. James's Hall in 1899 and had been a Vice-President ever since the policy of the Society had been laid down as including lesser measures, found himself unable to remain any longer a member of the Society unless we expunged total prohibition altogether from our parliamentary programme.

The Society was therefore placed in a dilemma between losing the valued support of the Duke or

calling together all the subscribers to re-open the question of the Society's policy which had been definitely settled by them in 1897.

With very great reluctance the committee in such circumstances felt bound to leave the question of policy undisturbed, and consequently suffered the loss of both the Duke and Duchess of Portland.

It seems somewhat strange that although the Society lost the support of these two illustrious Vice-Presidents, only because it did not see its way to expunge total prohibition from its programme, it has nevertheless been made the subject of ceaseless attacks from the British Union on the supposed ground that it does not advocate the very policy for adhering to which it lost the support of the Duke and Duchess of Portland !

In 1903 Miss Lind-af-Hageby and Miss Schartau informed Mr. Coleridge that they had witnessed as students a very painful experiment on a dog, which they asserted, was not under complete anæsthesia and struggled.

Mr. Coleridge asked them to make their statement in writing, which they did, and received from them an assurance that they were prepared to testify to the truth of their statement if necessary in the witness box.

Mr. Coleridge thereupon read out the statement at a great public meeting at St. James's Hall, and accused Dr. Bayliss of doing what the two ladies had described.

Dr. Bayliss brought an action for libel against

Mr. Coleridge; the two ladies honourably fulfilled their pledge of supporting their statement on oath in the witness box. Dr. Bayliss brought witnesses to swear that anæsthetics were administered to the dog by means of a pipe brought under the floor, from an automatic pump in another room, in the charge of a laboratory boy, up through a hole in the table, and into the dog's throat by way of a tube. His witnesses also explained the struggles by asserting that this particular dog had St. Vitus's dance.

Apparently the jury believed in the pipe, and the pump, and the boy, and the anæsthetics, and the St. Vitus's dance, and thought the ladies had missed seeing the tube when they looked at the dog. So they gave a verdict for Dr. Bayliss for £2,000 damages, which entailed costs of another £3,000.

The verdict was given at five o'clock in the evening, and Dr. Bayliss, with that delicate refinement of taste so natural to a vivisector, sent a messenger round at ten o'clock the next morning to Mr. Coleridge demanding the £2,000—"bearer waits."

No doubt the triumphant litigant thought to humiliate Mr. Coleridge by forcing him to ask for a decent time to find the money, but "the bearer" did not, as it happened, have to "wait" longer than to allow Mr. Coleridge time to draw a cheque for the £2,000 on his private account at the Bank of England. The return of the messenger with the money, we may surmise, somewhat deflated Dr. Bayliss, though it were vain to hope that it could teach him better manners.

The public were so incensed at the monstrous damages that in a very short time the whole of the £5,000 was subscribed, and Mr. Coleridge had to stop the contributions, but not before he was able to hand to the Society nearly £1,000 that he had received over and above the necessary £5,000.

The continual attacks upon the Act of 1876 made by our Society in letters to the Home Office, articles in the *Contemporary*, *Fortnightly*, and other publications, and by way of questions in the House of Commons, where for many years we had the valued assistance of Sir George Greenwood, at last forced the Government to appoint a second Royal Commission to inquire and report upon the whole question of vivisection.

This Royal Commission began to sit in 1906, and did not issue its report till 1912.

The vivisectors sent their best controversialists to give evidence before it. Some of the anti-vivisection associations sent persons very ill-fitted to stand cross-examination by a set of able men.

It did not help our cause for witnesses to go there and say they thought we ought not to "exploit animals" at all, thus suggesting that there is something morally wrong in eating an egg, drinking a glass of milk, or wearing shoe leather.

They caused the vivisectors on the Commission diversion and delight.

Our Society was represented by Mr. Coleridge, who was under cross-examination for four days, and replied to 1,519 questions.

The British Union did not send any witness to represent them and subject himself and their policy to cross-examination, which was a pity.

In the result the Commission made the following recommendations :—

1. An increase in the inspectorate.
2. Further limitations as regards the use of curare.
3. Stricter provisions as to the definition and practice of pithing.
4. Additional restrictions regulating the painless destruction of animals which show signs of suffering after experiment.
5. A change in the method of selecting and in the constitution of the advisory body to the Secretary of State.
6. Special records by experimenters in certain cases.

Not one of these recommendations accords with any of the demands put forward by the witnesses representing the vivisectors—every one of them is in the direction of affording better protection to vivisected animals.

In 1910 Mr. Coleridge received an invitation to visit America, as the Representative of our Society, and to address the two Houses of the Legislature of the State of New York on the law relating to cruelty to animals and particularly on the law relating to vivisection.

He went over in February, travelled to Albany and delivered his address to the two Houses of the Legislature assembled together in the Lower House.

He was received with great courtesy, remained for some time at the conclusion of his address at the table answering questions from all parts of the House, and was thanked for attending.

Before returning to England Mr. Coleridge

addressed a packed mass meeting in one of the theatres in New York City on Vivisection.

In 1911 our Society inaugurated a monster petition to Parliament against the National Insurance Bill which endowed "research."

At one of the deputations to the Home Secretary, at which Mr. Coleridge attended as spokesman for our Society, he elicited from the Home Secretary the assurance that in every case where a vivisector intended to employ curare he was directed to give notice to the Home Secretary forty-eight hours in advance, in order that a Government inspector should invariably be present.

Since the war the Society has supported Sir Frederick Banbury's Dogs' Bill in every possible way, and Mr. Coleridge headed a deputation to the Home Office to put the case in favour of that Bill forcibly before the Government.

But it has been in vain ; the Government has officially opposed the Bill and sent out its whips against it.

At the present moment Mr. Coleridge has applied to appear as a witness on behalf of our Society, before the Committee appointed by the Ministry of Health to inquire into the finances of the Voluntary Hospitals of London.

Such is the record of only the chiefest of the fields of effort filled by the Society since it was founded. From the beginning till now the fight has been waged with a deep conviction that it is a combat for right against wrong, that it is a great moral and religious contest, which may claim the blessing of God.

